

Todd M. Friedman (SBN 216752)  
Adrian R. Bacon (SBN 280332)  
Meghan E. George (SBN 274525)  
Tom E. Wheeler (SBN 308789)  
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.  
21550 Oxnard St., Suite 780  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Phone: 877-206-4741  
Fax: 866-633-0228  
tfriedman@ toddflaw.com  
abacon@ toddflaw.com  
mgeorge@toddfllaw.com  
twheeler@toddfllaw.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

STEVE GALLION, individually and on ) Case No.  
behalf of all others similarly situated, )

Plaintiff, )

vs. )

BLUE STAR CRUISES, LLC, and )  
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and each )  
of them, )

Defendant. )

**CLASS ACTION**

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS  
OF:**

1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS  
OF THE TELEPHONE  
CONSUMER PROTECTION  
ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)]
2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS  
OF THE TELEPHONE  
CONSUMER PROTECTION  
ACT [47 U.S.C. §227(b)]

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff STEVE GALLION (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based  
upon personal knowledge:

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others

1 similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable  
 2 remedies resulting from the illegal actions of ALLIED SECURITY INC.  
 3 (“Defendant”), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on  
 4 Plaintiff’s cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection  
 5 Act, 47. U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”) and related regulations, thereby invading  
 6 Plaintiff’s privacy and causing her to incur unnecessary and unwanted expenses.

### 7 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

8 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff,  
 9 a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at  
 10 least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a  
 11 Delaware corporation. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages for each call  
 12 in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed class in the  
 13 thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court jurisdiction.  
 14 Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under the Class  
 15 Action Fairness Act of 2005 (“CAFA”) are present, and this Court has jurisdiction.

16 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central  
 17 District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because Defendant does  
 18 business within the State of California and Plaintiff resides within the County of  
 19 San Bernadino.

### 20 **PARTIES**

21 4. Plaintiff, STEVE GALLION (“Plaintiff”), is a natural person residing  
 22 in San Bernando, California and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

23 5. Defendant, BLUE STAR CRUISES, LLC (“Defendant”), is a cruise  
 24 line limited liability company, and is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

25 6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are  
 26 collectively referred to as “Defendants.” The true names and capacities of the  
 27 Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are  
 28 currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious

names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Beginning in or around April of 2017, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on Plaintiff's cellular telephone number ending in -6963, in an attempt to solicit Plaintiff to purchase Defendant's services.

9. Defendant used an "automatic telephone dialing system" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its call to Plaintiff seeking to solicit its services.

10. Defendant contacted or attempted to contact Plaintiff from telephone numbers confirmed to belong to Defendant.

11. Defendant's calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

12. Defendant's calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

13. During all relevant times, Defendant did not possess Plaintiff's "prior express consent" to receive calls using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on his cellular telephone pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

14. Defendant placed multiple calls soliciting its business to Plaintiff on

1 his cellular telephone ending in -6963 beginning in or around April of 2017 and  
2 continuing for several months.

3 15. Such calls constitute solicitation calls pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §  
4 64.1200(c)(2) as they were attempts to promote or sell Defendant's services.

5 16. Plaintiff received numerous solicitation calls from Defendant within a  
6 12-month period.

7 17. Upon information and belief, and based on Plaintiff's experiences of  
8 being called by Defendant despite having no prior relation to Plaintiff whatsoever,  
9 and at all relevant times, Defendant failed to establish and implement reasonable  
10 practices and procedures to effectively prevent telephone solicitations in violation  
11 of the regulations prescribed under 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

### 12 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

13 18. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others  
14 similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereinafter, "The Class"),  
15 defined as follows:

16  
17 All persons within the United States who received any  
18 solicitation/telemarketing telephone calls from  
19 Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made  
20 through the use of any automatic telephone dialing  
21 system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such  
22 person had not previously consented to receiving such  
23 calls within the four years prior to the filing of this  
24 Complaint

25 19. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of all  
26 persons within the United States who received any solicitation/telemarketing  
27 telephone calls from Defendant to said person's cellular telephone made through  
28 the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded  
voice and such person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone  
number to Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

1           20. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class.  
2 Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the  
3 Class's members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should  
4 be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

5           21. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its  
6 members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class  
7 members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through  
8 appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that  
9 The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class  
10 members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

11           22. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of  
12 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff  
13 and The Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and  
14 The Class members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which  
15 Plaintiff and The Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or  
16 administer messages left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the  
17 privacy of said Plaintiff and The Class members.

18           23. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The  
19 Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of  
20 The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between  
21 Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual  
22 circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 23           a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this  
24 Complaint, Defendant made any telemarketing/solicitation call  
25 (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with  
26 the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class member  
27 using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial  
28 or prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a

1 cellular telephone service;

2 b. Whether Plaintiff and The Class members were damaged  
3 thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and

4 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such  
5 conduct in the future.

6 24. As a person that received numerous telemarketing/solicitation calls  
7 from Defendant using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or  
8 prerecorded voice, without Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting  
9 claims that are typical of The Class.

10 25. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members  
11 of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of  
12 class actions.

13 26. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and  
14 efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims  
15 of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class's member could afford  
16 individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome  
17 to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed.  
18 Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent,  
19 or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties  
20 and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual  
21 issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer  
22 management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court  
23 system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

24 27. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members  
25 would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical  
26 matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such  
27 adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-  
28 party Class members to protect their interests.

1        28. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable  
2 to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to  
3 the members of the Classes as a whole.

4                                    **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5                    **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

6                                    **47 U.S.C. §227(b).**

7                                    **On Behalf of The Class**

8        29. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action  
9 the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.

10        30. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
11 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
12 and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*, and in particular  
13 *47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)*.

14        31. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*,  
15 Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled an award of \$500.00 in statutory  
16 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B)*.

17        32. Plaintiff and The Class members are also entitled to and seek  
18 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

19                                    **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

20                    **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection**

21                                    **Act**

22                                    **47 U.S.C. §227(b)**

23                                    **On Behalf of The Class**

24        33. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action  
25 the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-28.

26        34. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous  
27 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not  
28 limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of *47 U.S.C. § 227(b)*,



and in particular 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

35. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b), Plaintiff and The Class members are entitled an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

36. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

#### **47 U.S.C. §227(b)**

- As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and The Class members are entitled to and request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B).
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

#### **47 U.S.C. §227(b)**

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and The Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C).
- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

///



**JURY DEMAND**

37. Pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

Respectfully Submitted this 24th Day of August, 2018.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s/ Todd M. Friedman  
Todd M. Friedman  
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman  
Attorney for Plaintiff